

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 13-108 are pending.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 15, 29, 35, 37, 38, 40-42, 44, 47, 49, 52, 66, 77-84, 93, 98-102, 104, and 106 have been amended for clarity.

Claims 1 and 35.

Referring to claims 1 and 35, the July 11, 2007 Office Action (“Office Action”) states that “it is not clear how the examiner should perform a search for the claimed invention.” Office Action, p. 2. The Office Action continues, “For example, user inputs “Yes” for creating a document, and applicant’s claimed invention decides which component it should use” *Id.*

Claim 1 relates to a “method for generating documents”, and claim 35 includes “code for generating documents.” Applicants have amended claims 1 and 35 for clarity. Claim 1 has been amended for clarity to recite “receiving input data that includes information useful for generating a document from a plurality document components.” Claim 35 has been amended for clarity to recite “code configured to: access input data that includes information useful for generating a document from a plurality document components.” Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of claim 1 is clear and searchable in that “in response to receiving the input data” the method includes processing rules to determine which of one or more document components of the plurality of document components to include in a document.” The method further includes “obtaining each of the plurality of document components to be included in the document as determined by the processing of the rules”, “generating said document to include each of the obtained document components”, and “making said document available to a user.” Some of the claims dependent upon claim 1 include “wherein said document comprises a contract” (Claim 73), “wherein at least one of said plurality of document components are defined as a standard component, required component, or optional component” (Claim 74), and “said component-to-component relationships comprise an includes relation” (Claim 75).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention of claim 35 is also clear and searchable in that “in response to accessing the input data” the code is further configured to,

process rules to determine which of one or more document components of the plurality of document components to include in a document”. The code is further configured to “obtain each of the plurality of document components to be included in the document as determined by the processing of the rules”, “generate said document to include each of the obtained document components”, and “make said document available to a user.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 35 are clear and searchable.

Claims 15 and 52.

Referring to claims 15 and 52, the Office Action states that “it is not clear how the examiner should perform a search for the claimed invention.” Office Action, p. 2. The Office Action continues stating, “For example, user inputs “6%” and “Good Morning” for creating a document,” *Id.* Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is clear and searchable in that the method of claim 15 requires “receiving selection inputs selecting a compensation component and a textual component.” Thus, the selection inputs must select “a compensation component and a textual component.” “in response to receiving the selection inputs”, the method continues by “processing rules to determine which of one or more components of a plurality of components to include in a document in addition to the compensation component and the textual component.”

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 52 is also clear and searchable in that the code of claim 52 is configured to: “access selection inputs selecting a compensation component and a textual component” and “in response to accessing the selection inputs, process rules to determine which of one or more components of a plurality of components to include in a document in addition to the compensation component and the textual component.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15 and 52 are clear and searchable.

Claims 29 and 66.

Referring to claims 29 and 66, the Office Action states that “including respective rules associated with the compensation component and the textual component in a document template” is not “tied to the claimed invention”. Applicants have amended claims 29 and 66 for clarity to provide proper antecedent basis in the “including” element of claim 29 and the “include” element of claim 66 for the document template. Claim 29 generates “at least one compensation component” and “at least one textual component”. Claims 29 also requires “including respective rules associated with the compensation component and the textual component in a document template.” “The rules include component-to-component relationships and at least one of the component-to-component relationships identifies under what circumstances to include a first component in the document template when a second component is included in the document template [[or]] and controlling how a configuration engine processes the document template to configure a document with one or more of the components.” (as amended). So, the document template includes such rules and the method also requires “associating said at least one compensation component and said at least one textual component with the document template.” Thus, “including respective rules associated with the compensation component and the textual component in a document template” is tied to the claimed invention by including such rules in the document template, and the document template is associated with the generated at least one compensation component and at least one textual component.

Claim 66 includes code configured to “generate at least one compensation component” and “at least one textual component”. Claims 66 also includes code configured to “include respective rules associated with the compensation component and the textual component in a document template.” “The rules include component-to-component relationships and at least one of the component-to-component relationships identifies under what circumstances to include a first component in the document template when a second component is included in the document template [[or]] and to control how a configuration engine processes the document template to configure a document with one or more of the components.” (as amended). So, the document template includes such rules and the code is also configured to “associate said at least one compensation component and said at least one textual component with the document template.”

Thus, the code configured to “include respective rules associated with the compensation component and the textual component in a document template” is tied to the claimed invention by including such rules for the document template, and the document template is associated with the generated at least one compensation component and at least one textual component.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the elements of claims 29 and 66 are tied to the claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
October 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839